Remarks

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application.

Claims 9-10, 21-22, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 9 and 21 have been amended to recite "an initial amount of data." Claims 9-10, 21-22, and 25 have been amended to delete "Infiniband."

Claims 1-11, 13-23, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0117375) in view of Boyd (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0049580).

Independent claims 1, 13, 26, and 27 have each been amended to clarify that the data access task is pre-emptible between the first response and a first subsidiary request, and between a subsidiary response and a subsequent subsidiary request. Independent claim 25 recites "pre-empting context resources associated with issuance of the first remote access command from the first node prior to completion of the task associated with the first remote access command." There is no teaching or suggestion in the cited prior art of the claimed combinations including the data access task being pre-emptible and pre-empting context resources.

The preemption feature is illustrated in the example embodiment of the invention shown in Fig. 2. Note the pre-emption point between block 201 and block 202. Also note the pre-emption point following block 203.

Saha describes direct memory access for performing database operations between two or more machines. The Examiner directs particular attention to Figure 5 and paragraph 60, which describes a series of data transfers and acknowledgments. That is, in Saha, each data transfer is followed by an acknowledgment when all of the data held in the buffer is used. Upon receiving the acknowledgment, the client can then place more data into the buffer.

The Examiner acknowledges that Saha does not disclose a data access task. The Examiner relies on Boyd as a secondary reference. Boyd does describe work queue entries. However, the work queue entries in Boyd do not involve subsidiary requests and responses as claimed. That is, Boyd discloses a work queue entry, but does not disclose a data access task as claimed. The claimed data access task is partially completed by the first response and further completed by each subsidiary response. There is no such teaching in Boyd.

Further, there is no teaching of the claimed subject matter including the data access task being pre-emptible between the first response and a first subsidiary request, and between a subsidiary response and a subsequent subsidiary request, or of pre-empting context resources. To the extent that Boyd describes a data access task, there is no pre-emption when the data access task is only partially completed as claimed.

For teaching pre-emption, the Examiner only relies on Saha. The portions of Saha referred to by the Examiner do not describe such pre-emption, but only describe data buffering and a series of data transfers and acknowledgments. That is, there is no pre-emption of a data access task, the client terminal only places more data into a buffer when the buffer is empty without the occurrence of any pre-emption.

The pre-emption feature is recited in each independent claim. Accordingly, claims 1-11, 13-23, and 25-27 are believed to be patentable.

Claims 12 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha in view of Boyd, further in view of Turner (An Approach For Congestion Control In Infiniband).

Claims 12 and 24 are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable.

Respectfully submitted,

Pazhani Pillai, et al.

By___/Jeremy J. Curcuri/_____
        Jeremy J. Curcuri
        Reg. No. 42,454
        Attorney for Applicant

Date: August 7, 2009

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351